





CRIME AND DELINQUENCY TOPICS:  
A Monograph Series

Community Based  
Correctional Programs

Models and Practices

National Institute of Mental Health  
Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

The following monographs in the Crime and Delinquency Topics series are available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

*Civil Commitment of Special Categories of Offenders* (PHS Pub. No. 2131)

*Crime and Delinquency Research in Selected European Countries* (PHS Pub. No. 2140)

*Diversion From the Criminal Justice System* (PHS Pub. No. 2129)

*Graduated Release* (PHS Pub. No. 2128)

*The Juvenile Court: A Status Report* (PHS Pub. No. 2132)

The views expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the position and policy of the National Institute of Mental Health or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

**Public Health Service Publication No. 2130**

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C. 20402—Price 30 cents

## Foreword

This monograph is one of a series of literature reviews and evaluative discussions on current topics of significance in the area of crime and delinquency. These monographs are designed to inform program administrators, policy makers, and other interested persons about significant findings to date which may be useful in the development and improvement of programs in the crime and delinquency area, and about research gaps and needs.

Development of this series has been sponsored by the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency of the National Institute of Mental Health. The Crime and Delinquency Topics monographs were prepared by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency under a contract from the National Institute of Mental Health. This monograph, *Community Based Correctional Programs: Models and Practices*, was prepared by Eleanor Harlow, Information Analyst, NCCD, and J. Robert Weber and Leslie T. Wilkins, Consultants.

Saleem A. Shah, Ph.D.  
*Chief, Center for Studies  
of Crime and Delinquency*



For several years theorists and practitioners have argued for community based correction programs if correction is to attain the mission of making law-abiding citizens of convicted offenders and adjudicated delinquents. Community treatment, however, as a term used to describe such a wide variety of efforts at every stage of the correctional process, has lost all descriptive usefulness except as a code-word with connotations of "advanced correctional thinking" and implied value judgments against the "locking up" and isolation of offenders. Although the practice of handling offenders outside the institution is not especially new, the development of "community treatment" as a powerful catch-word appears to be fairly recent. As the term has become popularized, and as the phrase is increasingly associated with avant-garde thinking in corrections, the concept has been stretched to include a widening variety of treatment efforts, some of which are "community based" only in that they are less isolated and confining than the traditional prison.

In the literature on alternatives to institutionalization, the descriptive term "community treatment" has been applied to probation and parole (these being the traditional noninstitutional correction measures); probation alone (parole in this case considered an extension in the community of institutional treatment); aftercare (juvenile parole) and halfway house "bridges" between the institution and free society; community-based institutions (located in the community, with perhaps some use of community resources for health, education, or recreation purposes); noninstitutional boarding arrangements such as foster care, small group homes, semi-institutional or "open" cottage living; forestry, work, or outdoor probation camps; and a number of daycare programs, outpatient clinics, and nonresidential work/group-therapy programs. Occasionally, community treatment is viewed as encompassing efforts which are essentially preventive, such as street work with antisocial gangs or early identification and treatment of "predelinquents." The latter are of necessity community-based because in most cases the formal processes of criminal justice have not been invoked.

This lack of clear delimitation might be at least partly attributed to the phenomenon of "jumping on the bandwagon." Increasing evidence that institutionalization may be more destructive than rehabilitative, and may in fact increase probabilities of recidivism, initiated a trend which emphasizes alternatives to imprisonment or, where institutionalization is felt to be necessary,

transitional programs in the community to facilitate reintegration.

Disillusionment with the traditional correctional institution as a rehabilitative tool appears justified. Research evaluating imprisonment has received support from studies which reveal the ineffectiveness of institutionalization not only in correctional but in mental health, child care, and related fields. Following a California study of the effects of institutionalization on mental patients, which found that this experience did not improve the social competence of the mentally ill, a study was made in that State of the deterrent effects of criminal penalties.<sup>1</sup> Penal legislation in California, as in most other States, has been based on the presumed deterrent effect of severe penalties. In this study substantial evidence was found to suggest that lengthy incarceration does not deter crime or recidivism. Recidivism rates of released prisoners were found to be generally constant for all States despite variations in correctional practice. Specific analysis supporting the general conclusions included studies of attacks on police officers, marihuana offenses, and bad-check writing. In each of these cases, increased penalties did not deter commission of the offense. Reducing incarceration time was found to effect no significant increase in recidivism, and in some cases was associated with a decrease in future offending.

Not only has it been shown that imprisonment does not effectively rehabilitate or deter, but the actively destructive potential of most correctional institutions frequently has been emphasized. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice has reported that "life in many institutions is at best barren and futile, at worst unspeakably brutal and degrading . . . The conditions in which [inmates] live are the poorest possible preparation for their successful reentry into society, and often merely reinforce in them a pattern of manipulation or destructiveness."<sup>2</sup>

Disenchantment with imprisonment as a corrective measure, however, seems to have led to a less than critical acceptance of noninstitutional alternatives as "more effective." Both classification and evaluation of community correction programs are complicated by this lack of clarity and by the interference of value-laden assumptions. As popular and professional support for incarceration of offenders has declined and as the goals of reintegration, resocialization, and rehabilitation have replaced punish-

<sup>1</sup> Crowther, Carol. Crimes, penalties, and legislatures. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 381:147-158, 1969.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967. 159 pp.

ment as primary theoretical concerns, it has become fashionable to label any modification of traditional incarceration as "treatment" and any effort to reduce isolation of the offender as "community-based treatment." As a result it has become extremely difficult to identify actual alternative dispositions for those offenders who are candidates for incarceration or to make realistic judgments of their relative effectiveness. In reviewing practices of "community treatment," one must first determine which programs are in fact noninstitutional alternatives and then attempt to distinguish those evaluative results which are relatively free from the influence of interfering variables, including ideological commitment to program on the part of both project and research personnel.

### Alternatives to Institutionalization

Within the range of correctional efforts commonly referred to as community treatment there can be discerned a category of programs which are accurately considered alternatives to institutionalization and which also may be fairly clearly distinguished from regular probation supervision. These might be called *intensive intervention in lieu of institutionalization*. Intensive intervention as an *alternative* to institutionalization would seem to imply exactly that—a means of handling the offender without incarceration. This would not include *post*-institutional measures such as parole or other aftercare, halfway houses for releasees, work furlough, imprisonment at night or on weekends, or any other program of partial or intermittent confinement or of "transitional" management as part of a sentence of imprisonment. Such measures may be favored as improvements over custodially oriented, punitive isolation; they may even be found to effectively rehabilitate. But if the objective is to avoid the negative effects of isolation from the community, the severing of family ties and noncriminal associations, and the institutional culture, then for those offenders for whom institutionalization is neither necessary nor beneficial, the correctional alternative would seem to require that no kind of formal institutionalization be imposed.

The importance of distinguishing a type of disposition discrete from both the institution and probation is pointed up not only by research on the effects of institutionalization; research in probation has suggested that certain offenders do very well with minimal supervision and that many do not require greater attention than is provided under regular supervision. Studies of offenders under normal probation supervision have revealed a relatively high success rate. A recent study of 943 male probationers 16-18

years old revealed that about 72 percent were successfully discharged.<sup>3</sup> In a summary analysis of 15 probation studies in various jurisdictions, Ralph England found reported success rates to vary between 60 and 90 percent; and a survey of probation effectiveness in such states as Massachusetts, California, New York, or in a number of foreign countries, presents similar reported results with the modal success rate at about 75 percent.<sup>4</sup>

England explains that many offenders are "self-correcting" and are not likely to recidivate, while others would be dissuaded from further offending merely through exposure to the limited surveillance of the suspended sentence. Empey suggests that, since the majority of offenders now placed on probation can succeed without intensive supervision, many of those offenders now incarcerated might succeed under intensified community supervision.<sup>5</sup> These observations imply that intensive intervention, or specialized treatment in the community setting, should be viewed *not as an alternative to probation*—which seems to do fairly well for a large number of the individuals now served—but as an alternative to the institutionalization of those offenders who are seen to require greater control than that offered by regular probation supervision.

In other words, while the probation system could be upgraded by changes in structure and operation, it should not be viewed by even its severest critics as an outdated predecessor of the newer community programs. There is considerable evidence that many offenders do well under regular supervision and there is no reason to subject them to further and more intensive "treatment." Probation and intensive intervention both are viable alternative dispositions, each with distinct advantages and uses. The latter envisions a much greater involvement with the offender than mere supervision and attempts to achieve a sometimes considerable modification of values, attitudes, and behaviors which may extend beyond the prevention of specific violations of the law. Probation should be retained as a separate disposition of low intervention level. Intensive intervention can make possible the management in the community of those offenders who otherwise would be placed in an institution. For those now institutionalized, the alternatives to be considered would be imprisonment or inten-

<sup>3</sup> Scarpitti, Frank R., and Stephenson, Richard M. A study of probation effectiveness. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 59(3):361-369, 1969.

<sup>4</sup> Cited by LaMar T. Empey (*Alternatives to Incarceration*, Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1967.); England, Ralph. What is responsible for satisfactory probation and post-probation outcome? *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 47 (March-April):667-677, 1957; Grunhut, Max. *Penal Reform*. New York: Clarendon, 1958, pp. 60-82; and Tappen, Paul W. *Crime, Justice and Correction*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960, pp. 576-584.

<sup>5</sup> Empey. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

sive community supervision; for those now on probation the alternatives would be regular probation, minimal supervision, or suspended sentence with no supervision.

### *Varieties of Intensive Intervention*

Intensive intervention programs, then, are those which provide the means for retaining in the community those offenders who are eligible for institutional placement because they cannot be placed safely and effectively under probation supervision. Most of the community alternatives which have been developed fall generally into one of three classifications: (1) specialized units of probation and parole agencies (probation "plus," or more intensive involvement and supervision than normal probation); (2) nonresidential intensive treatment (attendance centers, guided group interaction programs); or (3) residential programs and out-of-home placement alternatives. A fourth category may develop from the community correctional center. The distinctions among categories are not always clear. Some specialized units in probation or parole may be so intensive that they are difficult to distinguish from daycare; and some residential programs are so structured and self-contained that they must be classed as community-based institutions, rather than as alternatives to incarceration. The groupings nonetheless may be generally useful in identifying alternative noninstitutional dispositions.

### **Specialized Units in Probation Parole**

While a valid distinction may be made between regular probation or parole supervision and intensive intervention, much of the most interesting research with relevance for the design and operation of intensive community programs has come from the fields of probation and parole. In recent years, the emphasis of research in these areas has shifted from the question "Is probation effective?" to "Under what conditions is probation effective?" For many years it was believed that if caseloads could be reduced, if officers had more time to devote to each case, then probation (or parole) supervision could more effectively rehabilitate. The 50-unit caseload—and, more recently, the 35-unit caseload—has been repeatedly recommended as the "ideal." Specialized units in probation and parole have developed from the findings of caseload research.

### ***Caseload Research***

Despite the appeal of reducing caseloads to improve supervision, research during the past decade has clearly indicated that merely reducing caseload size is not the answer. A parole re-

search project in Oakland, California, began in 1959 to test whether reducing caseloads of parolees in Alameda County, California, would improve parole performance.<sup>6</sup> Additional agents were employed and ten experimental 36-unit caseloads were set up, with five 72-unit caseloads as controls. When the project was terminated in 1961 no overall difference was found between parole performance in reduced and in full-size caseloads. It was observed that many parolees required so much service that a modest increase in agent time available for each case had little effect.

The University of California's San Francisco Project has undertaken to study Federal probation and parole and to examine the effects of specific caseload sizes.<sup>7</sup> Individuals placed on probation or parole were randomly assigned to caseloads receiving one of four types of supervision: minimum, intensive, ideal, or normal. Persons in minimum or "crisis" supervision caseloads were required only to submit a monthly written report to the probation office; no routine contacts occurred except when requested by the offender. Intensive caseloads consisted of 20 units each and contact occurred at least weekly; ideal caseloads were composed of 50 units; and normal caseloads consisted of 100 units per month. It was found that, when cases were randomly assigned to different degrees of supervision, offenders in minimum caseloads performed as well as would be expected had they been receiving normal supervision; the minimum and the ideal caseloads had violation rates which were almost identical; and in intensive caseloads, despite 14 times the attention provided the minimum cases, the violation rate not only failed to decline but increased with respect to technical violations. These results were interpreted as suggesting that some offenders will succeed under supervision regardless of the type of service, while others will violate no matter how much treatment they receive; and that with identification of these offenders, officer time could be allocated to give most attention to those whose success depends on the presence of certain types of supervision. It was concluded that the concept of 50-unit (or any other number) caseload is meaningless without systematic classification and matching of offender type, treatment, and officer.

The Special Intensive Parole Unit (SIPU), conducted in California from 1953 to 1964, obtained similar results.<sup>8</sup> Study of parolees released to caseloads of various sizes found no differences in violation rates until parolees were classified according to

<sup>6</sup> Johnson, Bertram M. The 'failure' of a parole research project. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 18(3):35-39, 1965.

"risk" categories on base expectancy scores (i.e., estimates of probability of recidivism) and assigned on this basis rather than randomly. It was found that while, regardless of size of caseload, high-risk parolees violated extensively and low-risk parolees seldom violated, the middle-risk cases performed distinctly better in smaller caseloads. The low-risk cases did as well in very large caseloads as in regular caseloads.

As supporting evidence accumulated, the emphasis in research shifted from reducing caseloads to classification of offenders and development of appropriate treatment types. One of the most widely acclaimed experimental demonstration projects, the California Youth Authority's Community Treatment Project, was established to test the feasibility of substituting intensive supervision of juveniles in the community for the regular program of institutionalization plus parole and to develop optimum treatment control plans for defined types of offenders.

### ***The California Community Treatment Project***

The Community Treatment Project (CTP) was instituted in California in 1961. Phase I, completed in 1965, had the following as its objectives: (1) to determine whether selected Youth Authority wards could be released directly from a reception center to a treatment control program in the community, and whether communities would be willing to accept the return of wards who had just been committed to the Youth Authority; (2) to compare the effectiveness of a period of intensive supervision in the community with treatment in the regular institutional program; and (3) to develop hypotheses regarding specific treatment plans for defined types of delinquents in specific settings.<sup>9</sup>

During Phase II (1964-1969) the Project continued to develop data relevant to the goals of the first phase, with special emphasis on determining which treatment variables are most related to success on parole for different types of delinquents. Efforts were made to describe program elements in detail to provide a research base for extension of the program, for training correctional staff, and for comparison with other community programs.<sup>10</sup>

In brief, the research procedure consisted of the following. After assessment of eligibility for the project and classification according to I-Level (i.e., a measure of level of interpersonal maturity), male and female Youth Authority wards committed from the juvenile courts of Sacramento, Stockton, San Francisco, and Modesto were randomly assigned to experimental or control sta-

<sup>9</sup> Stark, Heman. Alternatives to institutionalization. *Crime and Delinquency*, 13(2):323-329, 1967.

<sup>10</sup> California. Youth Authority Department. *The Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*. Sacramento, 1969. p. 1.

tus. Experimentals were treated in an intensive community program; controls went into the usual Youth Authority program. In San Francisco (Phase II) experimentals were randomly assigned to one of two different forms of community treatment: a Differential Treatment Unit or a Guided Group Interaction Unit.

The CTP progress reports have been consistently positive in their evaluation of the experimental program. During Phase I, the program was judged to be feasible in the community and the overall success rate of the project participants was found to be significantly higher than that of youths in the regular Youth Authority program. Differential success rates were reported: certain types of youths appeared to do especially well under the given treatment conditions while others did about as well as they would have in an institution or on parole.<sup>11</sup> Additionally, in terms of psychological test scores, experimentals were observed to have achieved greater positive change and a higher level of personal and social adjustment than control subjects. Throughout Phase II, ongoing followup of study subjects from both phases continued to indicate large differences favoring experimentals over controls. Factors associated with greater effectiveness of the community program have been identified: (1) differential and treatment-relevant decisionmaking; (2) matching of types of offenders with types of workers; (3) intensive and/or extensive intervention by workers made possible by reduced caseloads; (4) ability and perceptiveness of workers; and (5) emphasis on working through of the worker/ward relationship.<sup>12</sup>

Another explanation of these results has been offered. Robinson and Smith have analyzed the findings of the Community Treatment Project in terms of factors which influenced the recidivism rates of experimentals and controls.<sup>13</sup> They explain that recidivism rates can be influenced, within certain limits, by the decision-making authorities, and that in the CTP study, rates were managed in such a way as to make the experimentals appear favorable. Quoting from the seventh Progress Report (1966) of the CTP, they show that 68 percent of control failures and only 29 percent of the experimental failures were accounted for by the agent's recommendation that parole be revoked. Quoting Lerman<sup>14</sup> in a re-examination of the data, the authors explain that when the offense is of low or moderate severity, experimentals are less likely to have their parole revoked; they are treated

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 9.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 10.

<sup>13</sup> Robinson, James, and Smith, Gerald. The effectiveness of correctional programs. To be published in *Crime and Delinquency*, January 1970.

<sup>14</sup> Lerman, P. Evaluating the outcome of institutions for delinquents. *Social Work*, 13(3):1968.

similarly to controls only when the offense is of high severity. Experimentals, they conclude, were no less delinquent in their behavior than the controls. They suggest that the important point is that an ideological belief in the effectiveness of community treatment apparently altered the experimental results.

Research findings on the relative effectiveness, in terms of recidivism at least, of one major community project are equivocal. Despite the enthusiastic endorsement that the CTP has received from most sources, it appears that the experimental program is not yet established as clearly superior to institutionalization *for reducing the recidivism rate*. While intensive intervention programs generally are less costly and probably less personally damaging than the institutional experience, evaluative reports of all such projects should be scrutinized for interfering variables which might affect or determine relative success in terms of violation rates.

### ***Community Delinquency Control Project***

Another community-based treatment program for young offenders who normally would be institutionalized is the Community Delinquency Control Project (CDCP) of the California Youth Authority Department. This program also offers intensive supervision in the community, makes use of multiple resources, and provides different types of treatment. Both the Community Treatment Project and the CDCP are located in community centers which serve selected offenders released directly on "parole" without prior institutionalization. The main difference between the two projects is that the Community Treatment Project systematically classifies offenders in terms of Interpersonal Maturity and matches types of wards with types of supervising officers.

The Community Delinquency Control Project was begun in 1964 in an effort to reduce overcrowding in Youth Authority Institutions, to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of such a program in the community, and to effect significant and lasting behavioral change in a nondelinquent direction.<sup>11</sup> Three CDCP units were established in Los Angeles and one in Oakland, California. Each unit was designed to supervise 95 wards in the intensive phase (for an average of 12 months) and up to 50 program graduates under less intensive supervision. Wards receiving intensive service are placed in caseloads of 15, with each agent carrying a total caseload of fewer than 25 parolees. The major treatment elements include: increased general supervision, intensive individual counseling, group and family counseling, remedial tutoring, psychiatric and group-work consultation for agents, in-

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit., supra* note 9.

creased use of subsidized out-of-home (foster home and group home) placements, and activity groups for wards. Originally, wards eligible for CDCP placement were male, first admissions to the Youth Authority. Eligibility was later broadened to include both sexes, juvenile court readmissions, and adult-court first admissions.

Two of the project goals were rapidly achieved: commitments to juvenile institutions were reduced and the community and law enforcement officials demonstrated their acceptance of the program. In March 1966 a random experimental design was introduced in two Los Angeles units to determine whether CDCP eligible wards assigned to the program do better than CDCP eligibles assigned to a regular Youth Authority program.<sup>16</sup> The California Youth Authority reports that it is too early to derive any definite conclusions from the Los Angeles study. Their tentative analysis showed that of 187 CDCP male first commitments, 51 had violated parole within six months (27.3 percent) as compared to 29.4 percent of the 102 controls. More reliable information is promised in the final report scheduled for 1970.

A 1968 study of 565 male wards released to the four CDCP units (not including the Los Angeles study population) reported a parole violation rate of 41.6 percent over 15 months, as compared to 47.7 percent for wards on parole statewide. It is suggested that, since CDCP eligibles were statistically poorer risks (younger and excluding offenders against persons), the difference between the program population and a true control group might be much greater. In July 1969 the four CDCP units were terminated and converted into Community Parole Centers. The program elements of these centers are generally the same as in the CDCP, except that all parolees from the local community will be served, rather than selected wards in lieu of institutionalization.<sup>17</sup>

The Community Delinquency Control Project, like the Community Treatment Project, has not yet provided unqualified support for the thesis that management of offenders in the community is significantly *more* successful in preventing further crime than is institutionalization. However, both programs have demonstrated a more important fact: offenders normally not released to community supervision can be as safely and at least as effectively handled in intensive intervention programs without institutionalization.

<sup>16</sup> A comparative study of the Community Delinquency Control Project. In: *The Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*, op. cit., *supra* note 10, pp. 29-31. *Community Delinquency Control Project - Los Angeles Study: Progress Report* (May 1965) and *Progress Report Number 2* (May 1969), by Esther M. Pond. Sacramento, 1968, 1969.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 33. Assessment of the Community Parole Center Project.

### *Other Programs of Specialized Supervision*

Another attempt to test the effectiveness of intensive community intervention was the San Francisco Rehabilitation Project for Adult Offenders, instituted to provide individual offenders with a helping relationship focused on changing patterns of behavior.<sup>18</sup> Its purpose was to replace a jail or prison term with professional counseling in the community. The offender sample of 109 subjects was intended to be broadly representative of the group normally sent to jail and prison, although Robinson and Smith report that project cases tended to be somewhat younger, with fewer minority group members, and a disproportionately high number of property offenders and low number of narcotic offenders.<sup>19</sup> The final report of this project suggested that while the superior results obtained by the community program must be considered tentative, it is safe to conclude that intensive counseling by professionally trained workers can reduce recidivism at least as effectively as imprisonment. It is emphasized that this program can be set up by existing governmental agencies and that its economic returns, in terms of support of the offender and his dependents during treatment, can exceed the costs of treatment.

Most of the programs of specialized supervision that have been instituted in various parts of the United States have not been rigorously evaluated. Assessments of "effectiveness," where this has been attempted at all, frequently are not very useful—no control group is used, the groups are not comparable, or assignment is not random. Many descriptive studies merely report the subjective judgments of staff or the observed changes in arrest patterns over time of the project participants. This means that much of the "community treatment" literature must be guardedly interpreted; but it is still useful in suggesting the variety of intervention alternatives which have been tried and which may be duplicated elsewhere.

A very broad range of services and programs have been provided for the treatment of offenders who require more intensive services than regular supervision: group or family counseling may be offered as a service of the juvenile court; the offender may be referred to a psychiatric clinic for additional treatment; probation officers may meet in frequent sessions of guided group interaction with selected probationers; the juvenile probationer may be required to attend daycare centers or centers providing remedial education and vocational training; or juveniles for whom living with their families is contraindicated because of undesira-

<sup>18</sup> Northern California Service League, *Final Report of the San Francisco Rehabilitation Project for Offenders*, San Francisco, 1968. 56 pp.

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 13.

ble home situations may be placed in foster homes, group homes, or in "halfway houses."

The Positive Action for Youth (PAY) Program has been operating at various community schools in Flint, Michigan, since September 1966.<sup>20</sup> This program provides intensive treatment and attention to male juvenile probationers, including group counseling, work experience, family counseling, supportive action, and individual counseling with concerned school and social agency personnel. The probationer's peers, teachers, and family also participate in the program. An attempt is made to deal with the range of family problems, rather than just the needs of the program participant. In 1968 the program was evaluated to ascertain the attitudinal and academic progress of participants. Although no controlled study was undertaken, police arrests for the 55 probationers dropped from 38 to 9 following participation in the program and overall grade averages in school improved.

Some courts have utilized local volunteers to work with juvenile offenders in various capacities, providing tutoring assistance, foster homes, group discussion sessions, counseling, or simply a supportive relationship with an adult community resident. The Juvenile Court of Boulder County, Colorado, instituted a program involving over 200 volunteers in programs of delinquency prevention and treatment. One of these, the Attention Home program, is a group foster-home program totally supported by the community.<sup>21</sup> Children who live in the Home are encouraged to participate in the special probation programs, already established and staffed by community volunteers, which provide tutoring, group discussion sessions, and relationships with adults; they are also encouraged to participate in community arts and craft programs, classes, and job training.

The variety of services available as an adjunct to probation has permitted many courts greater flexibility in their disposition of offenders for whom neither probation nor institutionalization is suitable. However, in a large number of jurisdictions the court simply has no available alternatives to imprisonment and many offenders are sent to prison or training school because probation supervision is not felt to be sufficient. The State probation subsidy programs have emerged in an attempt to reduce costs and overcrowding in State institutions by handling more offenders in the local community. Some of the savings resulting from reduced

<sup>20</sup> Current Project: Positive Action for Youth (PAY). Correspondent: Maxwell Terrance. Mott Crime and Delinquency Prevention program, Flint Board of Education, 923 E. Kearsley Street, Flint, Michigan, 48502. (Project report number in Information Center files).

<sup>21</sup> U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Office. *The Attention Homes of Boulder, Colorado*, by John E. Hagardine. Washington, D.C., 1968. 23 pp.

commitments are returned to the county probation departments for purposes of expanding and upgrading probation services.

### *State Subsidy Programs*

In 1965, the California State Legislature passed legislation which provided a State subsidy to county probation departments to set up "special supervision" programs, to increase the degree of supervision of individual cases, and to develop and improve supervisory practices.<sup>22</sup> Reduced commitment rates of offenders to State correctional institutions was made a mandatory condition for the receipt of subsidy monies. The enabling legislation was the result of the recommendation of a 1964 study undertaken to determine how State costs could be reduced while county probation programs were improved. This study found wide variations in the frequency of the use of probation in different counties and determined that 25 percent of State correctional commitments could be maintained safely and effectively within county systems if probation facilities were improved.<sup>23</sup> The plan which was ultimately adopted provided for reimbursement by the State to the counties in proportion to the number of cases retained in the county exceeding the existing rate. A sliding scale was developed to avoid penalizing counties which already had a low commitment rate. Since its implementation, the subsidy program has resulted in a reduction of expected institutional commitments by 2,481 in 1967-1968. Forty-seven percent of this number were adults. Of the 36 counties participating in the program, all but two have reduced their expected commitment rates.<sup>24</sup>

One example of the county programs developed under the California State subsidy is the Special Supervision Unit Program of Santa Barbara County Probation Department.<sup>25</sup> This program provides intensive, individualized supervision as an alternative to institutionalization. Caseloads are limited to 42 cases per officer. Each officer receives training in classification and diagnosis. All cases are classified by I-Level methods on a scale that determines the individual's level of social integration. Methods of treatment vary with type of offender, but the basic goal of early confrontation and intensive involvement with the probationer is standard. Typically, the offender is seen two to four times per month in addition to group counseling, a public agency therapy program, or a

<sup>22</sup> For a description of the origin of State subsidy program in California and six other States, see: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Research Center. *Research, Demonstration and Social Action*. Prepared by Leslie T. Wilkins and Don M. Gottfredson for the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. Davis, Calif., 1969. pp. 43-70.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>25</sup> Santa Barbara County Probation Department. *Special Supervision Unit Program*. Santa Barbara, Calif., 1968. 9 pp.

special Unit program (such as the Work Project) one-half day per week. Minor violations may be handled in the Unit or by modification of probation, thus serving as a lesson in rehabilitation.

Not all State subsidy programs have been used to upgrade or modify probation supervision. In Oregon, State funds were used to develop small-group home facilities and in Philadelphia a day center was established.<sup>26</sup> The concept of the State subsidy to county probation departments or, as in Oregon, to the public or private agency operating the program, is a flexible tool which could be used not only to finance improvements in probation services or to set up specialized units, but also can provide the means for the development of a wide range of other community programs for offender rehabilitation.

### **Nonresidential Intensive Treatment**

#### ***Attendance Centers***

The attendance center, or "daycare," represents an alternative to institutionalization for probation failures or for offenders who require more intensive care than probation but would not benefit from incarceration. This approach permits offenders to live at home and concentrates solely on a school and counseling program. As Weber notes in the report of the Juvenile Institutions Project (1966), some specialized units in probation and parole agencies which have developed services involving youth almost daily in program activities are difficult to distinguish from the daycare program.<sup>27</sup> Attendance centers provide a structured correctional "in-house" program, as opposed to the use of existing community services or outside employment. Placement in such a program is the result of a court order and it is an alternative to commitment, not an alternative to probation; it is either a condition of probation as ordered by the judge or a condition of parole, as ordered by the State Authority.<sup>28</sup>

The Philadelphia Youth Development Day Treatment Center was created as a result of legislation passed in 1965 providing for the State to match funds on a 50:50 basis, using Federal Manpower Development Training Act monies.<sup>29</sup> Juveniles are assigned to the attendance center by the court as a condition of probation. The Center's program is designed to improve probation services to boys whose rehabilitation may be achieved through vocational

<sup>26</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 22.

<sup>27</sup> Weber, J. Robert. *A Report of the Juvenile Institutions Project*. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1966. 192 pp.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 192.

and academic training and intensive individual and group counseling while they continue to live at home; and to reduce the institutional commitment rate of boys who are capable of adjustment outside the training school setting.

In 1965, a day program for delinquent girls was established in San Mateo County, California, to alleviate overcrowding in placement facilities for this group of offenders.<sup>20</sup> The program is based on the belief that a child should be kept in her own home and community whenever possible and that parents should continue to be responsible for their child. To encourage parental acceptance of responsibility, the parents are instructed by the court to pay a certain amount of their child's expenses and the girl and her parents share responsibility for compliance with the conditions of the program. Girls accepted for this program continue to live at home and attend the center during the day for school classes and counseling. One of the most important criteria for acceptance into the program is that the girl must have a "meaningful adult" able to give her an appropriate home.

With a high ratio of staff to children (probation officer caseloads are limited to twelve), this program provides services to the child and her family—together and individually—to keep the family intact. Each girl is involved in group counseling with her probation officer twice a week. Many of the parents also are involved in group counseling with their child's probation officer. One night a week the parents meet in a group at the center and at least once a week both parents and children are seen individually or conjointly for counseling.

Aftercare is provided when the staff decides that a girl no longer needs to come to the center every day, with the needs of the child and her family determining the aftercare planning. The probation officer continues to work with the girl on aftercare, and some of the parents continue to attend the family group meetings.

It is reported that the program appears to have definite advantages over the traditional institution program for the type of adolescent treated, but that final evaluation must await the results of research currently being conducted. The girls admitted to this program will be compared over a three-year period with a similar group of girls in institutions and in a group daycare program outside the county, in terms of costs, recidivism, other overt behavioral measures of adjustment, and on psychometric tests.

The Girls' Unit for Intensive Daytime Education (GUIDE) in Richmond, California, is a voluntary neighborhood program for

<sup>20</sup> Post, Gene C.; Hicks, Robert A.; and Monfort, Mariam Felicia. Day-care program for delinquents: a new treatment approach. *Crime and Delinquency*, 14(4):353-359, 1968.

girls, ages 14 to 17, who fail to adjust adequately on probation. Girls are referred to the program by their probation officer; if there is an opening and the girl indicates she is willing to participate, entry is accomplished by court order. This program offers group counseling, remedial education, and home management experience in maintaining and improving the Center. A parents' group meets weekly and family counseling sessions are held as needed. The goals of the program are to instill in the girls responsibility and a sense of self-esteem; to raise academic level and performance; and to strengthen family ties. The cost of the program is approximately one-half the cost of placement in a closed institution.<sup>31</sup>

### ***Guided Group Interaction Programs***

Of the various kinds of nonresidential programs which have been experimented with, one group of programs can be distinguished by their common theoretical orientation. These are the guided group interaction (GGI) programs, which are primarily concerned with peer group dynamics and the operation of the peer group in restructuring the youth "subculture" around more socially acceptable norms and values.<sup>32</sup> These programs also depend sometimes to a considerable extent on the involvement of youth in their own treatment. While other nonresidential programs frequently incorporate the group session into the daily program, less emphasis is placed on the peer group as the major treatment resource.

GGI programs involve the delinquent in frequent and intensive group discussions of their own and other members' current problems and experiences. Based on the theory that antisocial youth behavior receives the support and approval of the delinquent peer group, and that substituting acceptable norms for delinquent values and attitudes also requires the support of the peer group, these programs encourage the development of a group culture and the acceptance by members of responsibility for helping and controlling one other. As the group culture develops and the group begins to accept greater responsibility, the staff group leader allows the group a greater degree of decisionmaking power. Over time, the group's responsibility may extend to decisions involving disciplinary measures imposed on a member or determination of a member's readiness for release.

---

<sup>31</sup> Winters, Carolyn, and Greer, Rae. A county looks to its girls. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 20(4):17-21, 1969.

<sup>32</sup> For a discussion of the theory and practice of peer group dynamics in corrections, see: Empey, LaMar T. *Peer Group Influences in Correctional Programs*. Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C., 1967. 51 pp.

Demonstration projects based on the use of peer group dynamics derived their program content from the Highfields project, established in New Jersey in 1949.<sup>23</sup> Highfields was a short-term residential program for a maximum of 20 boys at any given time, ages 16 and 17. The boys worked during the day at a nearby mental institution and participated in guided group interaction sessions in the evening. There were few formal rules. The project was judged to be at least successful as a training school, in terms of recidivism, and much less costly. The basic principles of Highfields have been applied in nonresidential settings with apparent success. Essexfields, Collegefields, and the Provo experiment are perhaps the best known examples.

Guided group interaction programs are unique in that the group process itself is expected to determine the culture and social system of the entire program. The decisionmaking authority permitted the group is considerably greater than in traditional group therapy, possibly a crucial factor in the rehabilitation of youth through group influence and support.

### ***The Provo Experiment***

The Provo program was initiated in 1959 in Provo, Utah, in an effort to provide an alternative placement for those delinquents whose persistent offenses made them candidates for an institution. The underlying theory of this program held that most habitual delinquency is a group effort or is sanctioned by the offender's peer group. It was postulated that habitual delinquents tend to be children of low-income families and tend to have experienced limited opportunity for conventional success and satisfaction,<sup>24</sup> and that membership in a delinquent system develops as an alternative means for achieving social, emotional, or economic goals. Treatment of delinquency was assumed to be most effective if the delinquent peer group is utilized as a source of support and the vehicle by which norms are perpetuated, problems solved, and sanctions imposed.<sup>25</sup> The Provo experiment involved a maximum of 20 boys, at any one time, ages 15 to 17, in an intensive daily program including work or school and guided group interaction sessions. Each day, following full-time paid employment or school, the boys went to the center for group sessions; at night they returned to their own homes.

<sup>23</sup> McCorkel, Lloyd W.; Elias, Albert; and Bixby, F. Lovell. *The Highfields Story: An Experimental Treatment Project for Youthful Offenders*. New York: Henry Holt, 1958. 182 pp.

<sup>24</sup> Empey, LaMar T.; Erickson, Maynard; and Scott, Max. The Provo experiment: evaluation of a community program. In: California Corrections Board. *Correction in the Community: Alternatives to Incarceration*. (Monograph No. 4). Sacramento, 1964. pp. 29-35.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Group development was given high priority since the group, rather than the staff alone, was given major responsibility for controlling member behavior and working out solutions to individual or group problems. This kind of activity requires techniques not generally associated with group psychotherapy: helping members to recognize and deal with group process problems, subgroupings, interpersonal relationships, and power structures within the group.<sup>36</sup>

In program design and implementation, an effort was made to provide means by which offenders could assume greater responsibility for their lives and to reward them for help that they were able to give to others. The offender was given an active reformative role rather than a passive one in which he is acted upon by others. Group development appeared to move through several stages, from minimal involvement of members to the acceptance by boys of increasingly heavy responsibilities. The more seriously boys were concerned with dealing with issues and helping others to change, the more they were likely to accept the common purpose of the group, to identify with other members, and to grant prestige to those who succeeded in the group.

Offenders assigned to the experimental program were compared to two control groups: one under regular probation supervision, the other incarcerated in a training school. Prior to the experiment, only about 50 to 55 percent of the kinds of persistent offenders who participated in the program were succeeding on probation. Six months after release, 73 percent of those initially assigned and 84 percent of those who completed the program had no record of arrest. Of the remainder, none had been arrested more than once and none had been sent to training school. It was concluded that the experimental program was responsible for improved success rates. During the same period, however, the success rate for those offenders on regular probation also rose to 73 percent for offenders initially assigned and 77 percent for those who completed probation; this was explained as probably due to the influence of the experiment on court and probation operations. Of the offenders sent to training school, 58 percent had been rearrested and half of these had been arrested two or more times. Youths released from the reformatory appeared to be nearly twice as likely to commit an offense as were program graduates.<sup>37</sup>

As Empey has pointed out, although both probation and the GGI program seemed to have resulted in considerably less recidivism than incarceration, these results must be confirmed

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

through replication.<sup>38</sup> Phase II of the Community Treatment Project is concerned with demonstrating the effectiveness of "Provo-type" treatment and comparing it with differential treatment in the community. Experimentals in San Francisco have been randomly assigned to either a Differential Treatment Unit or a GGI Unit. The GGIU does not use differential diagnosis as a basis for treatment although I-Level classification is made for research purposes. Wards in these Units participate in full-time school or work, and attend guided group interaction meetings. Each youth is assigned to a group on the basis of age. The group is led by the community agent whose average caseload size is 15. During the initial, intensive phase of the program, wards are required to attend group meetings for an hour to an hour and a half every weekday.

### *Essexfields*

The Essexfields Rehabilitation Project was established in 1959 in Essex County (Newark), New Jersey, on assumptions similar to those of the Provo experiment. Essexfields was envisioned as an extension of the Highfields project and the Residential Group Center programs patterned after Highfields.<sup>39</sup> Like these programs, Essexfields was to consist of short-term, group-oriented rehabilitation. In contrast to previous experiments, however, Essexfields was to be nonresidential. To insure broad-based community support, an advisory board of prominent local citizens was appointed and arrangements were made for the boys to work on the grounds of the county mental hospital. To facilitate transmission of the Highfields culture to Essexfields, the first admissions were a small group of Highfields boys.

One of the assumptions of the Essexfields program was that to intervene effectively in delinquent patterns of adaption it is necessary to create a setting which encourages the development and maintenance of a conventional social system.<sup>40</sup> Length of participation was indeterminate, but usually extended from four to five months. Each group of ten boys was kept fairly intact and progressed through the program as a distinct unit. Five days a week, the boys participated in the program from seven in the morning to ten at night, working during the day and taking part in group sessions in the evening. The program was limited to 20 boys at a time, ages 16 and 17, who had been referred by the juvenile court as a condition of probation. Boys who previously had been committed to a correctional institution were excluded.

<sup>38</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 4, p. 39.

<sup>39</sup> Elias, Albert, and Pilnick, Saul. The Essexfields Group Rehabilitation Project for youthful offenders. In: *Correction in the Community*, *op. cit.*, *supra* note 18, pp. 51-57.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

The Essexfields program was evaluated by comparing recidivism rates with the rates of groups on probation, in Residential Group Centers, and in the State Reformatory. Of a total of 1,210 cases gathered for the study, 943 were committed to probation supervision, 100 to Essexfields, 67 to Group Centers, and 100 to the State Reformatory. This study demonstrated that a program of treatment patterned after Highfields and other Group Centers can be carried out successfully in a nonresidential setting in the community.<sup>41</sup> Despite the potential hazards of the high delinquency area in which it was located, Essexfields demonstrated a rate of in-program failure that was slightly lower than that of the Residential Group Centers. Recidivism rates indicated that reformatory boys *could do no worse and might do better* at Essexfields or in the Group Centers. It was suggested that treatment might be improved if greater selectivity of cases were achieved.

### ***Collegefields***

Collegefields, established in Newark, New Jersey, in 1965, developed out of the same theoretical base as Essexfields and Provo, in that peer group dynamics were considered essential to modification of delinquent behavior and attitude. Collegefields however, sought not only to achieve delinquency rehabilitation through peer group influences but also to improve educational ability and achievement.<sup>42</sup>

To test the hypothesis that the dynamics of peer group interaction could be successfully applied to the rehabilitation of younger age groups, this nonresidential program was designed for 25 male delinquents and pre-delinquents, 14 and 15 years old. These boys participated in the program for a period of four to seven months. It was postulated that guided group interaction programs are effective only if the adolescents have a genuine sense of decision-making power in matters concerning their own lives.<sup>43</sup> To facilitate development of a positive peer culture which would possess this kind of decisionmaking power, the Collegefields daily schedule was designed to provide maximum opportunity for the boys to interact among themselves. The major function of the staff was to insure through skillful guidance that group decisions were in the best interests of the members' rehabilitation. Each weekday the boys participated in the program from 7:30 a.m. until 5 p.m.,

<sup>41</sup> Stephenson, Richard M., and Scarritt, Frank R. *Essexfields: a non-residential experiment in a group centered rehabilitation of delinquents*. *American Journal of Correction*, 31(1):12-18, 1969.

<sup>42</sup> Pilnick, Saul, et al. *Collegefields: From Delinquency to Freedom*, Report to the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Office on Collegefields Group Educational Center. Newark, Newark State College, 1967. p. 6.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

with academic classes in the morning and guided group interaction sessions in the afternoon. It was observed that although the daily afternoon meetings helped to formalize the subculture, language, and normative system of the peer group, internalization of these as well as development of allegiance to the group were achieved largely through interaction outside the group meetings.<sup>44</sup>

The academic program was a vital component of the Collegefields project. The planners were concerned with the relationships among antisocial or "acting-out" behavior, peer group influence, negative attitudes toward school and adults, and recurring educational failure. A major goal of the project was to alter the educational experience of delinquent or pre-delinquent boys. The objectives of the academic components of the program were to provide opportunities to acquire educational skills and attitudes necessary for successful achievement on the level at which the individual could function; to motivate students to attain skills which they would continue to develop upon release; to develop attitudes and behaviors acceptable in social activities; and to encourage use of community services. The basic curriculum of the local public school system was modified to meet individual student needs and remedial instruction was provided. Modern instructional techniques, visual aids, field trips, and discussions were utilized. During stays of from four to seven months in the program, boys advanced in achievement by as many as three academic years.

Although the Collegefields project was in existence for only two years, tentative evaluation was made. Comparison of outcome of experimental subjects with two control groups (a tested control group of boys on probation and a non-tested control group) demonstrated greater gains for the Collegefields boys on IQ, attitudes toward teachers and school, realistic self-assessment, and achievement motivation than were found among boys in the control groups. It was concluded that the Collegefields program provides a useful model for the rehabilitation of many delinquents in this age group, and that further experimentation is warranted.

#### ***The Parkland Non-Residential Group Center***

The Parkland experiment in Louisville, Kentucky, begun in March 1965 and terminated in July 1967, provided nonresidential treatment for younger (13½ to 15½ years) delinquents who were candidates for institutionalization. The purpose of the program was to demonstrate to the boys the desirability of socially acceptable behavior and to increase their interest in attending

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

school.<sup>45</sup> Sixty-three boys participated in the program, which used a guided group interaction approach, with a revised half-day educational plan, remedial assistance, and a half-day work setting. Parental participation was required for admission and an aggressive program of intensive family counseling was provided. Evaluation of the project concluded that the Center could not be termed a success in the sense of indicating new methods of treating and preventing delinquency in specific areas or among particular groups of boys. The findings were ambiguous and contradictory: only 14 of the 63 boys could be adjudged program successes and, while project participants improved more on four measures of delinquency, there was no significant difference between Parkland boys and controls in degree of delinquency during the followup period. In marked contrast to other community programs, the Parkland Center was judged to be "unreasonably expensive" even if its rate of success had been high.<sup>46</sup>

Despite this less than positive evaluation, the Parkland project did not contradict the overall conclusion that intensive intervention in the community is at least as effective as incarceration, or that offenders normally sent to an institution can be as safely retained in the community when special services are provided.

### **Out-of-Home Placement and Residential Treatment**

#### ***Group Homes and Foster Care for Delinquents***

Jurisdictions in which sufficient resources are not available to the courts frequently institutionalize those juveniles for whom living in their own homes is considered adverse to their rehabilitation, simply because the judge sees no alternative. Group home programs and foster care for delinquents have been developed to provide such alternatives.

*Foster homes* may be provided under a very wide variety of arrangements. Reporting on the findings of the Juvenile Institutions Project, Robert Weber states that the variety of administrative patterns and auspices of foster home programs defies concise description. In many jurisdictions, foster care is not administered by the local court; referrals are made by the court to other public and private agencies for foster care placement and, if the referrals are rejected, the judge must release the youth to his own home, commit him to an institution, or place him in a local detention center.<sup>47</sup> Foster care programs are operated by almost

<sup>45</sup> Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation. *Community Rehabilitation of the Younger Delinquent Boy: Parkland Non-Residential Group Center*. Final report to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. N.P., 1967. 132 pp.

<sup>46</sup> Current Project (final report): The Parkland Non-Residential Group Center. (Project No. P281 in Information Center files).

<sup>47</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 27, p. 174.

all States in which there is a State agency responsible for institutions and, where such an agency does not exist, the State may rely on the child welfare division of the State welfare department. Weber reports that where foster care is primarily a function of a State agency, with few local resources, commitment to the State becomes dependent, inappropriately, upon placement needs.<sup>45</sup> The Juvenile Institutions Project also found some disillusionment with foster care for delinquents, as expressed by reception center staffs. Weber reports that, while "foster care would seem to be in eclipse, based on discussions with State administrators, . . . a look at actual placements in foster care by State agencies and local courts indicates an unabated use of foster homes as a placement resource for delinquent children."<sup>46</sup>

Private families also may volunteer their services to care for juveniles in a family setting; these homes vary according to the number of children they accept, the qualifications of the foster parents, and the financial arrangements between the agency and the foster family.

The Detroit Foster Homes Project was undertaken to demonstrate that children who have lived in many homes and institutions and who manifest disturbed behavior can be placed and treated successfully in "highly reinforced" foster homes.<sup>50</sup> Boys between the ages of seven and thirteen, referred to the project by various Detroit agencies, were placed in foster homes, although all of them would have been difficult or impossible to place by the usual standards. Considerable professional time was devoted to each child and a major concern of the staff psychiatrists, educators, and research personnel was to develop improved methods of foster home placement and care.

The *group home* differs from foster care in a number of ways. Institution dwellings are owned or rented by the agency or corporate group and the operation is more closely supervised by professional staff at the agency or clinic.<sup>51</sup> Houseparents and other staff are employed on a working week, salaried basis. The facility continues to exist even if the houseparents resign. Generally, less family atmosphere is present in an agency-operated group home. There may be several unrelated adults providing casework in varying degrees of intensity. The staff of the group home program may consist of on-grounds personnel (resident houseparents and a groundworker) and off-grounds personnel (psychother-

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173.

<sup>50</sup> Current Project: The Detroit Foster Homes Project of the Merrill-Palmer Institute. (Project No. P487 in Information Center files).

<sup>51</sup> Gula, Martin. Group homes: new and differentiated tools in child welfare, delinquency, and mental health. *Child Welfare*, 43(8):393-397, 1964.

apists, psychiatric consultant, a group home caseworker, and a director).<sup>52</sup>

The contract group home may be operated by an organization such as a church or civic group, or by private individuals, and financed through a contract arrangement with the State agency. Agency-operated group homes are staffed by employees of the agency responsible for placing the youth in the program. Most of these are "halfway houses" for releasees from institutions, but there is an increasing use of such facilities as the initial placement of choice in lieu of institutional commitment. These "halfway-in" homes are used by courts for youth who fail on probation and by State agencies for placement of some committed juveniles directly from the reception centers.<sup>53</sup> Weber states that a clear distinction should be made between the agency-operated group home providing a program within the home and one which provides residence for a youth involved in a total program in the community.<sup>54</sup> The Juvenile Institutions Project found that the former was more often characteristic of the "halfway-in" program, while the latter was more often the case in "halfway-out" homes for releasees. It was also noted that some agency-operated group homes which provide considerable programming are difficult to distinguish from the small institution.<sup>55</sup> The point at which the group home can no longer be considered a noninstitutional alternative cannot be clearly identified.

The Silverlake experiment in Los Angeles is an example of an agency-operated group home providing a program. This program is similar to the Provo, Highfields, and Essexfields programs in that an effort is made to create a nondelinquent culture and to involve offenders in decisionmaking. Males, ages 16 to 18, who are seriously delinquent, are placed in a large family residence in a middle-class neighborhood in lieu of institutionalization. All the boys, not more than 20 at one time, live in the residence and attend school daily. They are also responsible for maintaining the residence and, except on weekends, which are spent at home, attend a daily group meeting. This meeting is the major formal mechanism for implementing program goals. The goal is to structure a social system in which emerging norms, and their observance, are a function of collaborative inmate-staff decisionmaking.<sup>56</sup> A study of the extent of actual collaboration between staff and boys found that information about problem behavior was

<sup>52</sup> Hentzen, Norman. What is a group home? *Child Welfare*, 43(8):403-414, 1964.

<sup>53</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 27, p. 178.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 176.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180.

<sup>56</sup> Empey, LaMar T., and Newland, George E. Staff-inmate collaboration: a study of critical incidents and consequences in the Silverlake experiment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 5(1):1-17, 1968.

freely shared (indicating the boys' interest in social control) and that the effectiveness of the program culture as a social control measure increased over time.<sup>57</sup>

The Attention Home program of Boulder, Colorado, which opened its first group home in the fall of 1966, is a distinctly different kind of group home program in concept, organization, and operation. The major difference is that the program is totally supported locally. Additionally, the program is run almost entirely outside any formal agency setting. The basic idea is broad community involvement in and support of court-led programs to curtail and prevent juvenile delinquency, without resort to institutionalization.<sup>58</sup> While the Attention Home program does have close cooperative relations with the court, this is predominantly a citizen-run organization. Most of the children residing in the Home are referred by police to the Juvenile Court, but some of them have been brought to the Court by parents who felt they could no longer control their children. Where living at home is considered to be detrimental to treatment of difficult and delinquent children, residence in the Home is available as an alternative. It is reported that local financing and broad policy participation by the community have some disadvantages. Goals and purposes are less clearly defined, much time must be spent on fund-raising, and the program might be terminated if the community were to lose interest. However, community involvement in the group home program tends to produce greater concern and understanding of the problems of the juvenile court and delinquency prevention and control. Because of extensive volunteer support in services and materials, the Attention Home costs considerably less than comparably-sized government supported group home programs.

There have been a number of reports that some adolescents adjust successfully in group homes when they had not been able to do so in single-placement foster homes.<sup>59</sup> This fact has been attributed to the less intense personal relationships required in the group home. Rabinow has suggested that the more impersonal environment of the group home may be best suited to the needs of the adolescent, since many adolescents are disturbed to the degree that they cannot tolerate the intimacy of family life in the foster home.<sup>60</sup>

The Group Home Project of the California Youth Authority was undertaken to develop and test temporary confinement facil-

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> *Op. cit., supra* note 21.

<sup>59</sup> *Op. cit., supra* note 27, p. 175.

<sup>60</sup> Rabinow, Irving. Agency-operated group homes. *Child Welfare*, 43(8):415-422, 433, 1964.

ties with varying and controllable atmospheres.<sup>61</sup> This project is an integral part of the Community Treatment Project, which has made wide use of out-of-home placements to facilitate the emergence of nondelinquent behavior patterns in CTP wards. The objectives of the project are to determine the feasibility of establishing five types of group homes for particular types of youths; to develop a taxonomy of relevant environments in terms of structure, nature of rewards and penalties, methods of teaching, and type of houseparents; to evaluate the impact of the group home experience on the youths assigned to them; and to evaluate the utility of each home and of group homes generally.<sup>62</sup>

Of the five types of group homes originally proposed, types I, II, and III were designed for the long-term placement of wards with specific I-Level classifications only; types IV and V were designed as temporary placement facilities for all types of youths. When no candidates were found for the fifth group home type (short-term restrictive home in lieu of detention home placement), a sixth type was designed and implemented. The characteristics of the different types of homes, houseparents, and wards assigned to them are described in detail in the first and second reports of the Group Home Project<sup>63</sup> and are summarized briefly in a recent report on California Youth Authority research.<sup>64</sup>

Evaluation has revealed that these homes in general have provided a readily available, needed placement resource for a substantial proportion of CTP youths. The feasibility of establishing and operating all but the Type V home has been demonstrated. While some difficulties have been experienced in the matching of parole agent personalities and treatment styles with types of wards, it has been concluded that group homes are one very meaningful and useful alternative.

The Juvenile Institutions Project found that where group homes have not succeeded, their failure was associated with one of three factors: (1) a lack of community acceptance; (2) a "poor fit" of the group home in the State's correction system; or (3) incongruence between program objectives and staff performance.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Pearson, John W., and Palmer, Ted. The use of group homes for delinquents in a differential treatment setting. (Group Home Project interim progress report). Sacramento: California Youth Authority Department, 1968. 29 pp.

<sup>62</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 10, p. 11. Group Home Project: differential treatment environments for delinquents.

<sup>63</sup> A number of complex dimensions have been identified as contributing to the relative success or failure of the homes; these and related issues are discussed in the first and second year progress reports. California Youth Authority Department, Division of Research. *Group Home Project: Research Reports*. Sacramento, 1967 and 1968.

<sup>64</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 10, pp. 11-16.

<sup>65</sup> *Op. cit.*, *supra* note 27, p. 184.

### **European Research Experience**

Research in European countries confirms the general conclusions of research within the continental United States. Where periods of detention in institutions have been varied, and the type of risk controlled for in any rigorous manner, the recidivism rates have not shown any significant change. No research, however, has varied the period of detention by a factor of more than 100 percent, and it is possible that different results might be found if the period was changed more dramatically. In some non-Western democratic countries there have been 'natural' experiments, where large numbers of incarcerated felons have been released as some form of celebration or by means of amnesty for other reasons. Where these cases have been followed up for periods of years, the reconviction rates have not shown any significantly different outcomes from the rates of those who were detained to complete their terms of imprisonment.<sup>66</sup>

The British experience, which perhaps comes closest to that of the United States, may be summarized to the effect that in general the less that has been done with respect to offenders, the better. Those placed on probation do not show significantly worse (or better) results than those given other, and more intensive, forms of punishment or treatment.<sup>67</sup>

European countries show considerably lower "incarceration" rates than the United States or Canada, a fact due mainly to the shorter periods of detention which are awarded for crimes of somewhat similar nature. It may be that the incarceration rates are lower because the general public is not so concerned about the crime problem in these countries, but the fact remains that the rates of recidivism do not reveal any major differences from those of countries with far higher incarceration rates.

### **Other Overseas Experience**

An interesting study carried out by the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge, England, (Attendance Centres) shows a rather unusual result. Two different forms of treatment probation and attendance centre, when used independently, were found to be of about the expected level of efficiency (as measured by recidivism rates), but were, when combined in a joint sentence for the same offender, far less effective than either form used singly. This result seems to show that there can be elements in programs for the rehabilitation of offenders which can more than "cancel

<sup>66</sup> Council of Europe. *The Effectiveness of Punishment and Other Measures of Treatment: European Committee on Crime Problems*. Strasbourg. 1967.

out" and militate against one another with an undesirable result for the offender. The explanation of this finding is still being sought. However, this study makes fairly clear that the mere addition of two "good" forms of treatment into a compound treatment may have very unexpected and undesirable results.<sup>64</sup>

### *Programs of External Treatment*

In England, two forms of noninstitutional treatment have been attempted, which, so far as is known, have not found application in the United States. The first is the Juvenile Liaison Scheme of the Liverpool and West Ham police. In this scheme a special section of the local police force is concerned with the supervision of young offenders who are not proceeded against in the normal manner, and who, after an interview with a senior police official, are placed under the care of a "Juvenile Liaison Officer." The scheme might best be described as a form of "informal" probation, where there is no finding of guilt (the offender admits the offence) and the police action is one of an official "caution." The "caution" is, however, supplemented by support for the young person and his family. This scheme has its strong supporters and equally strong critics.<sup>65</sup>

A second form of external "support" for families which are not "coping" (often a term covering behavior which might be designated "criminal") is provided by a voluntary body called "Family Service Units." Volunteers provide a form of "domestic service" for the noncoping households, while at one and the same time giving training in the domestic arts, including shopping, cleaning, and mending. This may be seen as a kind of "on-the-job training" for housewives who prove inadequate in various ways, especially in child care. The domestic assistance is provided for considerable periods if necessary to ensure that the home functions adequately, although the objective is for the trainer to leave the situation as soon as conveniently possible. The initial and prime aim, however, is to remedy the situational deficiency by taking over the role of household care and passing it back to the housewife as she learns to cope.<sup>70</sup>

In some respects, functioning in like manner to the work of the Family Service Units is the work of the "Home Helps." The majority of local authorities maintain a staff of trained "home helps." These are persons who can enter any home in an emergency and take over the maintenance functions of the housewife. These services are provided either free of cost or at low rates in

<sup>64</sup> McClintock, F. H., et al. *Attendance Centres*. London and New York: MacMillan and Co., 1961.

<sup>65</sup> *Annual Reports of the Chief Constable of Liverpool*, 1960 and later years.

<sup>70</sup> Philp, A. F. *Family Failure*. London: Faber and Faber, 1963.

accord with the income of the household. The circumstances in which the assistance of a "home help" may be requested differ somewhat from one area to another. One of their prime functions is to provide for the maintenance of the family while the house-wife is sick or involved in childbirth. It has been found to be far cheaper to provide facilities for the maintenance of the home rather than to take institutional measures to cope with emergencies.

A social movement is perhaps the best term to use for a further "outreach" development in both West Germany and the United Kingdom. Self-organizing groups have formed to deal with a variety of problems from drugs to abortion. Many of these are related to the "underground" and to student protest movements. They tend to be somewhat antagonistic to the normal sources of government intervention in social problems, but nonetheless provide a service to youth (particularly) who would not be reached by official agencies. One such organization known as BIT maintains a 24-hour telephone assistance service which gives advice on "crash pads" to the destitute, provides legal aid for those charged with drug offenses, facilitates psychiatric help in cases of "bad trips," and the like.<sup>1</sup> These self-organizing and "underground" groups provide a very useful service which cannot be provided by the official agencies, since much of their activity is "fringe" in terms of the strict interpretation of the law. Official agencies while providing help in a needed direction could not overlook, as these underground organizations can and do, other incidental information which might incriminate their clients in respect to other laws or, indeed with respect to the law in relation to that problem about which the individual seeks help. Youths who would not seek official help, because they would fear self-incrimination in the course of obtaining help, feel that they can approach these underground units. Youths in need feel that they can trust youths who have previously been in need. It is mainly young persons who have themselves "come through" an experience with abortions, drugs, or other problems who man the telephones and provide the other services of these bodies.

From time to time and in certain circumstances, the official legal bodies have considered it necessary to make moves against some of these underground self-organizing groups, but usually mild provisions have been invoked, such as laws relating to sanitary provisions on their premises. One body, known as "Release,"

---

<sup>1</sup> The Community Development Trust (Registered Charity #256108) facilitates and coordinates projects of self-help and makes it part of its function to keep in touch with many other out-reach operations by "underground" and similar groups. There has been little publicity and no known authoritative reports cover these often transitory and transitional activities.

has made public some of its activities in the publication *Release Report on Drugs*.<sup>72</sup> Often closely but loosely connected with some of these underground bodies are "progressive" but legitimate bodies who provide advice and some assistance. Perhaps the most nearly similar movement within the United States was the "Diggers" who provided some assistance at Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco, and also certain religious organizations who can accept "fringe" behavior and not present an image of "authority."

### The Community Correction Center

The term "community correctional center" usually refers to a community-based institution, located in a carefully selected neighborhood in an effort to reduce the isolation from community services and other resources. Most designs do not envision any considerable participation of the offender on the outside. Others are centers for released offenders where services are not provided in lieu of institutional commitment. One recent model, not yet implemented, does suggest a new direction for the community center: the Youth Correctional Center designed by the Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency.

A two-year project (1966-1968) undertaken by the Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency to develop conceptual, operating, and architectural designs for advanced correctional practice resulted in a proposal for a community-based program for young adult offenders.<sup>73</sup> This model program, like other residential programs, cannot be classified decisively as either community management or institutionalization, but in this case the blurring of the line is intentional. As director of the project, Bradley explains: "The line between being 'locked up' and 'free' is purposely indistinct because it must be drawn differently for each individual. Once the client is out of Phase I, where all clients enter and where they all are under essentially custodial control, he may be 'free' for some activities but still 'locked up' for others."<sup>74</sup> The program will include three residential units located in the high delinquency areas from which the young adult felon population is drawn. Some of the project wards will be kept in medium custody and others will be relatively free to pursue supervised outside employment, education, and community activities. Phase I consists of strict confinement at all times in the se-

<sup>72</sup> Coon, C., and Harris, R. *The Release Report on Drug Offenders and the Law*. London: Sphere Books, 1969.

<sup>73</sup> Bradley, H. B. Community-based treatment for young adult offenders. *Crime and Delin-*

cure unit (approximately one month). Phase II consists of residence in the secure unit, but with access to the outside community for work, school, or other activities (approximately three months). The third phase involves residence in the community, with return to the unit once a week or more for group meetings and special services. This third phase lasts about 20 months.

The treatment design is not a therapeutic community nor is it a guided group interaction model, but it does envision the sharing of decisionmaking with the correction client and use of the closed group as a major correctional resource. The model proposes an active client role in the treatment effort in two important areas: it will involve him in his own treatment and in the treatment of others by allowing him to share in treatment decisionmaking, and it will provide for the recruitment of staff from among project clientele. Treatment plans are designed for each client and conducted by the staff-client group; progress is marked by the movement of the client through a three-step progression and successful completion of a series of treatment plans. A central concern of the project planners and presumably of those who conduct the program is the utilization of the group and group processes in engendering and supporting positive behavior and attitudinal change.

The community correctional center is perhaps more accurately described as a community-based institution than as a noninstitutional community resource, even in the later phases of the treatment model. The Youth Correctional Center is part of a movement to place the correctional institution in the community in order to overcome the disadvantages of isolation from community resources and opportunities. An institution situated in the locale which supplies the offender population is better able to draw upon the medical, social work, psychiatric, educational, and employment resources of that community and to involve community residents and family members in offender rehabilitation and reintegration.

However, this is a new model which has yet to be implemented. The forms taken by programs based on this model could vary widely in degree of community contact, in the proportions of time spent in custody and living in the community, and in the amount of involvement of the offender in the decisionmaking process. This is a flexible design with a broad range of potential uses, and assessment must await its implementation.

#### ***“Community Treatment”: The Community as Correctional Client***

The growing emphasis on the role of the community in the etiology of crime and the rehabilitation of offenders, which un-

dergards the movement to establish corrections in the community settings, has led to speculation as to the proper goals of community correction programs. If the offender is to be retained in the community in order to facilitate his reabsorption into community life, then the correctional goal is presumed to be the reintegration of the offender. The goal of reintegration, as opposed to goals of punishment, removal from society, or even reform of the offender, implies a dual target: both the offender and the receiving community often must be changed if reintegration is to be achieved. A number of writers have suggested that community corrections involves change in both the offender and his society—that the task of corrections involves the reconstruction or construction of ties between the offender and the community through maintenance of family bonds, obtaining education and employment, and finding a place for the offender in the mainstream of social life.

One writer has suggested that the goal of social change and offender reintegration is not feasible for corrections.<sup>75</sup> First, the community will resist being cast in the role of correctional client and resent the associated stigma. In addition, the global nature of the goal of achieving reintegration prevents the delimitation of the boundaries of correction. If the goal is offender-community reintegration, the sphere of interest and responsibility of the correctional program is unlimited and success or failure cannot be operationally defined or assessed.

This observation has important implications for intensive intervention programs and any other correctional measures involving the community. If, as Weber suggests, the goal of community correction is to provide the means and opportunities for reintegration by directing the offender to community resources and acquainting the community with the needs and skills of the offender, then success may be defined as the appropriate provision of those opportunities. Community corrections, then, could concentrate on helping the offender to link appropriately with the normal community resource channels.

Community correction goals, and the relative weights to be given to treatment *in* the community as opposed to treatment *of* the community, need further attention and clarification to facilitate program evaluation.

<sup>75</sup> Weber, J. Robert. Goals of community correction: a redefinition. In: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Probation Management Institutes. (Papers to be published in 1970).

## Conclusions

In the California study of the effects of criminal penalties it was concluded that since severe penalties do not deter more effectively, since prisons do not rehabilitate, and since the criminal justice system is inconsistent and has little quantitative impact on crime, the best rehabilitative possibilities would appear to be in the community.<sup>76</sup> This reasoning is fairly typical of much current thinking in correction and it serves to illustrate the kind of cognitive leap on which enthusiasm for "community treatment" is based. If prisons do not rehabilitate, and if the stated goal of correction is to reduce recidivism through integration of offender and community, it seems irresistibly logical that treating the offender without removing him from society will be more effective. Unfortunately, while one may express the opinion that, since prisons are not effective (a validated observation), then one *might as well* retain offenders in the community, it cannot be assumed without adequate controlled research that the best *rehabilitative* possibilities are to be found in the community.

The most rigorous research designs generally have elicited the finding that offenders eligible for supervision in the community in lieu of institutionalization do *as well* in the community as they do in prison or training school. When intervening variables are controlled, recidivism rates appear to be about the same.

This is not to derogate community alternatives to institutionalization, for it is a most important finding: a large number of offenders who are candidates for incarceration may instead be retained in the community *as safely, as effectively, and at much less expense*. Additionally, the observed effects of the overcrowded and isolated institution on the personality and social adjustment of the incarcerated individual are avoided. It is unnecessary to demonstrate, as most experimental/research projects appear to feel pressured to do, that recidivism rates are *lower* when offenders are retained in the community. Given the fact that expensive and overcrowded institutions are not doing the job they are intended to do, it is appropriate to suggest that less costly, less personally damaging alternatives be utilized wherever they are at least as effective as imprisonment.

Until alternatives to institutionalization are demonstrated to be more effective than imprisonment in preventing further crime, a major rationale for the use of community programs will be that correctional costs can be considerably reduced by handling in the community setting a large number of those offenders normally institutionalized. Experimental/demonstration projects in intensive

<sup>76</sup> *Op. cit., supra* note 1.

intervention have shown that for a large number of institution candidates incarceration is clearly unnecessary. Thus, if society is still determined, in the light of this evidence, to keep these offenders in prisons and training schools, it must be willing to pay the price. The central question becomes: are the goals of punishment and custodial control worth the high costs of constructing institutions, and maintaining the inmate in the institution, as well as the observed and the still unknown personal and social costs incurred through exposing individuals to the institutional experience.

The cost of building an institution has been estimated at about \$22,000 a bed; maintaining and treating a ward in an institution costs about \$400 a month.<sup>77</sup> A study conducted by the District of Columbia Department of Corrections provides data on the correctional costs generated by the offense careers of 25 young men paroled from the D.C. Youth Center.<sup>78</sup> The subjects, whose median age was nearly 26 years, had spent an average of 32 months in the Youth Center, 8.5 months in Federal reformatories, 4.5 months in the D.C. jail, 23 months on parole, two months on adult probation, 16 months in welfare institutions, 22 months in foster homes, and six months on juvenile probation. During the average nine-year "criminal history," the offender experienced about 25 correctional actions and services. When the current costs of these actions were totaled for each offender, the individual costs ranged from over 13 to more than 68 thousand dollars, with a median cost of about 31 thousand dollars. A projected cost of about ten million dollars was estimated as the amount the public will have invested in this group by the time the men are finally released from supervision. It is suggested that this enormous expenditure could be reduced by the early management of young offenders in programs of greater cost effectiveness. Two recommendations are presented: "the introduction of community treatment programs such as those operated by the California Youth Authority; and the use of detached worker programs such as those developed in Los Angeles County." Cost comparisons led to the conclusion that "both these programs have shown a high level of cost effectiveness, and their ultimate result will be the saving of many millions of dollars in new correctional costs."

The cost savings obtained in substituting intensive intervention programs for institutionalization are clearly demonstrated in the concept and operation of the probation subsidy. Following a study which found that 25 percent of State correctional commit-

<sup>77</sup> *Op. cit., supra* note 9, p. 329.

<sup>78</sup> District of Columbia, Corrections Department. *The cost of correcting youthful offenders*, by Barbara Cantor and Stuart Adams. (Research report no. 6) Washington, D.C., 1968. 17 pp.

ments could be maintained safely and effectively in the community, where counties were given the means to improve probation, the California subsidy program was carefully "sold" to the State legislature in terms of a cost reduction.<sup>79</sup> During the 1966-1967 fiscal year, the 31 counties participating in California's subsidy program reduced institutional commitments to the extent that what would have been a 5.8 million dollar expenditure on institutional programs was reduced to 2.4 million for intensive supervision programs.<sup>80</sup>

The literature reflects a growing interest in cost-benefit analysis as a means of determining more systematically which correctional procedures actually "succeed" in terms of return on funds invested. Adams reports that the data from six controlled experimental projects, carried out between 1955 and 1967, permit greater precision in cost-benefit analysis.<sup>81</sup> The use of "new correctional costs," rather than recidivism rates, is taken as the primary index of adjustment in the community. According to Adams, comparative research reveals that the highest gain per capita is produced by the "community treatment project," while the group guidance project produces the highest gain per caseload. The results of further application of cost-benefit techniques to corrections might be developed and used to achieve optimal performance of the system as a whole.

Review of the literature on alternatives to institutionalization leads to one other observation: there is a conspicuous lack of interest in intensive supervision programs for adult prison candidates. While there has been some experience with reduced caseloads and specialized units in probation and parole agencies dealing with adult offenders, these have generally been limited to groupings based on age, sex, or offense category. Alcoholics, narcotic addicts, and misdemeanants are sometimes given special treatment, but it might be argued that such offenders should instead be *diverted from* the criminal justice system. Probation "plus" for adults has included attendance at mental health clinics and group therapy programs.<sup>82</sup>

Adults are more often handled by a "prison plus" approach: once confined to prison, selected inmates are then partially released on furlough, to work release programs, or to halfway houses. Evidence that many adult inmates can be safely released to work in the open community should suggest that most offenders

<sup>79</sup> *Op. cit., supra* note 22, pp. 43-46.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup> Adams, Stuart. Is corrections ready for cost-benefit analysis? (Revised version of paper presented at the 98th Congress of Corrections, August 1968). 24 pp. Mimeo graphed.

<sup>82</sup> For example, the Civic Center Clinic of the Brooklyn Association for the Rehabilitation of Offenders. See: Bassin, Alexander, and Smith, Alexander B. Group therapy with adult offenders on probation and parole. *Group Psychotherapy*, 12(1):52-57, 1959.

who are eligible for such programs could be safely and effectively retained in the community in the first place.

There would appear to be no factual basis for the assumption that only juveniles are significantly influenced by their peers, that group dynamics function only among the young, or that selected adult offenders could not greatly benefit from involvement in their own treatment and the decisionmaking process. Placement in a work/training/guided-group interaction program could be offered as an alternative to institutionalization for adults as well. Group homes and "foster family" or single placement boarding homes might even be made available *on a voluntary basis* to adult offenders without family or ties in the community or who need assistance until they are able to establish themselves in a job and neighborhood. Just as probation and the treatment orientation for adult offenders followed the development of these concepts for juveniles, adult correction might now be moved to benefit from the experience of juvenile correction in the community.

A major obstacle to the wider development and use of community alternatives in both adult and juvenile correction may be the widespread rejection of the offender by the community itself and the desire on the part of society to keep the offender "out of sight and out of mind." The task of "social" control has been relegated progressively to a smaller proportion of the social body, while the majority of society refuse responsibility for an increasing variety of behaviors and persons. Isolation and banishment have not "worked." Unless society is willing to keep a very large and growing number of its "offenders" in permanent custody, it must begin to accept greater responsibility in the areas of social control and correction.

The evidence obtained from experimental work in community programs, and supported by the results of experience with partial imprisonment and graduated release, the treatment of mental illness, and alternatives to processing by the criminal justice system, clearly indicates that a vast proportion of offenders could be managed in the community at least as effectively, and with much less cost, or diverted from the justice system entirely, thus returning to the community its responsibility for dealing with behavior it defines as antisocial or deviant.

The clamor for simple solutions must be resisted since it is already clear that the main characteristic of simple solutions is that they are wrong. Exploration by researchers of decision pat-

terns which can accommodate uncertainty should be of top priority. Professor Wilkins calls for constructive imagination. "I think we may safely assume that if anything is to be achieved by way of behavioral change it will have to come through means which are considerably different from any of those that are in practice, even in experimental stages at the present time."



# A Selected Bibliography

## Intensive Community Intervention

### “Community Treatment”: Rationale and Problems

Adams, Stuart. Is corrections ready for cost-benefit analysis? (Revised version of paper presented at the 98th Congress of Corrections, August 1968). 24 pp. Mimeographed.

Barnes, H.E. The contemporary prison: a menace to inmate rehabilitation and the repression of crime. *Key Issues*, 2:11-23, 1965.

Burdman, Milton. Realism in community-based correctional services. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 381:71-80, 1969.

California. Corrections Board. *Correction in the Community: Alternatives to Incarceration*. Sacramento: The Board, 1964. 64 pp.

California. Youth Authority Department. Planning local rehabilitation programs for juvenile offenders. Sacramento: The Department, 1965. 11 pp.

Community treatment. *Correctional Review*, September-October, 19-21, 1965.

Gibbons, Don C. *Changing the Lawbreaker*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

McFarlan, C. H. Alternatives to institutional treatment: for whom? whose problem? In: National Association of Training Schools and Juvenile Agencies. Pulliam, Jack C., ed. *Proceedings*, 63rd annual meeting, June 1967. Anaheim, California: The Association, 1967. pp. 48-63.

Massachusetts Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. *Proceedings on the Institute to Explore Alternatives to Mass Congregate Institutions for Delinquent Children and Youth*, Boston, January 24-25, 1967.

Moeller, H. G. Corrections and the community: new dimensions. *Federal Probation*, 32(2):30-32, 1968.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. *Research, Demonstration and Social Action*. Prepared by Leslie T. Wilkins and Don M. Gottfredson for the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. Davis, California: The Council, 1969. 235 pp.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Resources for children in trouble. A statement prepared for Project 74, Washtenaw County (Ann Arbor) Michigan, by Sherwood Norman. New York: The Council, 1964. 18 pp.

Nelson, E. K., Jr. Community-based correctional treatment: rationale and problems. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 374(November):82-91, 1967.

Newberg, Paula M. A study of how the concept of self is affected by incarceration. *Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy*, 12(3):258-262, 1966.

Norman, Sherwood. Delinquency prevention: three basic approaches. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1968. 27 pp.

Ohmart, Howard. The community and the juvenile. *Current History*, 53(312):94-101, 1967.

Scott, George D. The prisoner of society: a psychological study of captive man. Address to the McGill Psychology Club, Montreal, February 1966. Kingston, Ontario, 1966. 18 pp.

U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, D. C.: The Commission, 1967.

U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*. Washington, D.C., The Commission, 1967.

Weber, J. Robert. *A Report of the Juvenile Institutions Project*. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1966. 273 pp.

Weber, J. Robert, and Mayer, Mary. *A Strategy for Action in Establishing Alternatives to Training Schools*. New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1968.

### ***Specialized Supervision Units and Caseload Research***

Adams, Stuart. Some findings from correctional caseload research. *Federal Probation*, 31(4):48-57, 1967.

Bassin, Alexander, and Smith, Alexander B. Group therapy with adult offenders on probation and parole. *Group Psychotherapy*, 12(1):52-57, 1959.

Breed, Allen F. Rehabilitation and delinquency prevention: the California Youth Authority in 1968. *American Journal of Correction*, 30(4):24-27, 1968.

California. Corrections Department. Parole and Community Services Division. The work unit parole program. Sacramento: The Department, 1968. 30 pp.

California. Corrections Department. *Special Intensive Parole Unit, Reports, Phases I-IV*. Sacramento: The Department.

California. Northern California Service League. *Final Report of the San Francisco Rehabilitation Project for Offenders*. San Francisco: The League, 1968. 56 pp.

California. Youth Authority Department. Pond, Esther M. *Community Delinquency Control Project—Los Angeles Study: Progress Report (May 1968) and Progress Report Number 2 (May 1969)*. Sacramento: The Department, 1968-1969.

California. Youth Authority Department. Warren, Marguerite Q. The Community Treatment Project after five years. Sacramento: The Department, 1967. 14 pp.

California. Youth Authority Department. *Community Treatment Project: Research Reports*. Sacramento: The Department, 1962-1969.

California. Youth Authority Department. *The Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*. Sacramento: The Department, 1969. 76 pp.

Community based correctional programs. *Correctional Review*, September-October 33-36, 1965.

Grant, M.Q., and Warren, M. Alternates to institutionalization. *Children*, 10:147-152, 1963.

Johnson, Bertram M. The "failure" of a parole research project. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 18(3):35-39, 1965.

Los Angeles (County). Probation Department. Kawaguchi, Ray M., and Siff, Leon M. An analysis of intensive probation services: Phase II. (Research Report No. 29) Los Angeles: The Department, 1967. 40 pp.

Los Angeles (County). Probation Department. *Comparative Analysis of the Willowbrook-Harbor Intensive Services Program, March 1, 1965 Through February 28, 1966*. (Research Report No. 28) Los Angeles, 1966. 61 pp.

Loughry, Donald L. Innovations in probation management. *Crime and Delinquency*, 15(2):247-258, 1969.

Luger, Milton. Innovations in the treatment of juvenile offenders. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 381:60-72, 1969.

Nicholson, Richard C. Use of prediction in caseload management. *Federal Probation*, 32(4):54-58, 1968.

Palmer, Ted. An overview of matching in the Community Treatment Project. Presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Diego, California, March 1968. 21 pp.

Santa Barbara County Probation Department. Special supervision unit program. Santa Barbara, California, 1968. 9 pp.

Shireman, Charles. Innovations in juvenile court probation. *Juvenile Court Judges Journal*, 20(2):64-68, 1969.

Stark, Heman G. Alternatives to institutionalization. *Crime and Delinquency*, 13(2):323-329, 1967.

Stark, Heman. A substitute for institutionalization of serious delinquents: a California Youth Authority experiment. *Crime and Delinquency*, 9:242-248, 1963.

Takagi, Paul T., and Carter, Robert M. Persistent problems and challenges in correctional supervision. *Criminologica*, 5(3):36-46, 1967.

University of California. School of Criminology. San Francisco Project. Lohman, Joseph D.; Wahl, Albert; Carter, Robert M.; and Wilkins, Leslie T. Classification criteria for establishing caseload models. (Research Report No. 12) Berkeley: University of California, 1967. 14 pp.

University of California. School of Criminology. San Francisco Project. Lohman, Joseph D.; Wahl, Albert; Carter, Robert M.; and Lewis, Shirley P. The "ideal" supervision caseload: a preliminary evaluation. (Research Report No. 9) Berkeley: University of California, 1966. 40 pp.

University of California. School of Criminology. San Francisco Project. Lohman, Joseph D.; Wahl, Albert; Carter, Robert M.; and Elliott, Arthur E. The impact of supervision: officer and offender assessment. (Research Report No. 13) Berkeley: University of California, 1967. 92 pp.

University of California. School of Criminology. San Francisco Project. Lohman, J.; Wahl, A.; Carter, R.; and Lewis, S. The intensive supervision caseload: a preliminary evaluation. (Research Report No. 11) Sacramento: The University, 1967. 40 pp.

University of California. School of Criminology. San Francisco Project. Lohman, Joseph D.; Wahl, Albert; and Carter, Robert. The minimum supervision caseload: a preliminary evaluation. (Research Report No. 8) Berkeley: The University, 1966. 46 pp.

University of California. School of Criminology. San Francisco Project. Lohman, Joseph D.; Wahl, Albert; and Carter, Robert M. A non-technical description of the San Francisco Project. (Research Report No. 1) Berkeley: The University, 1965. 16 pp.

Warren, Marguerite Q. The Community Treatment Project: history and prospects. In: Yefsky, S.A., ed. *Law Enforcement Science and Technology*. Proceedings of the First National Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology. Washington, D.C.: Thompson Book Co., 1967. pp. 191-200.

Warren, Marguerite Q. *The Community Treatment Project: An Integration of Theories of Causation and Correctional Practice*. Presented at the Annual Conference of the Illinois Academy of Criminology, Chicago, May 14, 1965.

Warren, Marguerite Q. An experiment in alternatives to incarceration for delinquent youth: recent findings in the Community Treatment Project. In: California. Corrections Board. *Correction in the Community: Alternatives to Incarceration*. Sacramento: The Board, 1964. pp. 39-50.

Warren, Marguerite Q. Specialized units in probation and parole. In: Massachusetts Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. *Alternatives to Mass Congregate Institutions for Delinquent Children and Youth*. Boston: The Council, 1967.

### Nonresidential Intensive Treatment

Bixby, F. Lovell, and McCorkle, Lloyd W. Guided group interaction and correctional work. *American Sociological Review*, 16 (August):455-459, 1961.

Chazin, Robert M. Day treatment of emotionally disturbed children. *Child Welfare*, 48(4):212-218, 1969.

Davitto, B., and Scullion, T. An experiment in community treatment of delinquents. *Social Casework*, 38(1):10-16, 1967.

Elias, Albert. Highfields after five years. *Welfare Reporter*, 9(1):1-17, 1958.

Elias, Albert, and Pilnick, Saul. The Essexfields Group Rehabilitation Project for Youthful Offenders. In: California. Corrections Board. *Correction in the Community: Alternatives to Incarceration*. Sacramento: The Board, 1964. pp. 51-57.

Empey, LaMar T. Peer group influences in correctional programs. Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C., 1967. 51 pp.

Empey, LaMar T.; Erickson, M.; and Scott, M. The Provo Experiment: evolution of a community program. In: California. Corrections Board. *Correction in the Community: Alternatives to Incarceration*. (Monograph No. 4) Sacramento: The Board, 1964. pp. 29-38.

Empey, LaMar T., and Rabow, Jerome. The Provo experiment in delinquency rehabilitation. *American Sociological Review*, 26(5):679-696, 1961.

Henderson, Susan. Day care for juvenile delinquents: an alternative to out-of-home placements. *Judicature*, 53(1):19-21, 1969.

Kentucky Child Welfare Research Foundation. *Community Rehabilitation of the Younger Delinquent Boy: Parkland Non-residential Group Center*. Final report to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Louisville: The Department, 1967. 132 pp.

McCorkle, Lloyd W.; Elias, Albert; and Bixby, F. Lovell. *The Highfields Story: An Experimental Treatment Project for Youthful Offenders*. New York: Henry Holt, 1958. 182 pp.

McDonald, John. Meeting the educational needs of wards in the community. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 18(1):9-14, 1965.

Philadelphia. Youth Study Center: Eighth Progress Report. Philadelphia: County Court Juvenile Division, 1969.

Pilnick, Saul; Allen, Robert F.; and Clapp, Neale W. Adolescent integrity from Highfields to Essexfields and Collegefields. Paper presented to the National Conference on Social Welfare. Chicago, 1966. 17 pp.

Pilnick, Saul, et al. *Collegefields: From Delinquency to Freedom*. Report to the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Office. Newark: Newark State College, 1967.

Pilnick, Saul; Elias, Albert; and Clapp, Neale W. The Essexfields concept: a new approach to the social treatment of juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 2(1):109-124, 1966.

Post, Gene C.; Hicks, Robert A.; and Monfort, Mariam Felicia. Day-care program for delinquents: a new treatment approach. *Crime and Delinquency*, 14(4):353-359, 1968.

Rutgers, The State University. *The Rehabilitation of Delinquent Boys: Final Report (Essexfields)*. Submitted to the Ford Foundation, by Richard M. Stephenson and Frank R. Scarpitti. New Brunswick, N.J.: The University, 1967. 163 pp.

Scarpitti, Frank R., and Stephenson, Richard M. The use of the small group in the rehabilitation of delinquents. *Federal Probation*, September 1966.

Stephenson, Richard M., and Scarpitti, Frank R. Essexfields: a nonresidential experiment in group-centered rehabilitation of delinquents. *American Journal of Corrections*, 31(1):12-18, 1969.

Stephenson, Richard M., and Scarpitti, Frank R. Establishing a therapeutic milieu in a noninstitutional setting for delinquent boys. *Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy*, 14(10):10-23, 1968.

University of Southern California. Youth Studies Center. The Provo experiment: a brief review, by LaMar T. Empey. Los Angeles: The University, 1966. 26 pp.

Weeks, Ashley H. *Youthful Offenders at Highfields: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Short-Term Treatment of Delinquent Boys*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1958. 208 pp.

### **Residential Programs and Out-of-Home Placement**

Bradley, H. B. Community-based treatment for young adult offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*, 15(3):359-370, 1969.

Briley, Mike. Experiment in Silverlake. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 20(4):22-24, 1967.

California. Corrections Department. Parole and Community Services Division. *Community Correctional Centers*. Sacramento: The Department, 1968. 29 pp.

California. Youth Authority Department. Community Treatment Project. Turner, Estelle. A girls group home: an approach to treating delinquent girls in the community. (Report Series: 1969, No. 1) Sacramento: The Department, 1969. 35 pp.

California. Youth Authority Department. Pearson, J. W., and Palmer, T. B. The Group Home Project—a demonstration project: differential treatment environments for delinquents. (Research Report No. 1) Sacramento: The Department, 1967.

Empey, LaMar T., and Newland, George E. Critical incidents in the Silverlake experiment. Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association meeting, Long Beach, California, April 1, 1967. 21 pp.

Empey, LaMar T.; Newland, George E.; and Lubeck, Steven G. *The Silverlake Experiment: Progress Reports, Two and Three*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, Youth Studies Center, 1965-1966.

Florida. Youth Services Division. Walter Scott Criswell House: an opportunity for youth. Tallahassee, Florida.

Geis, Gilbert. The community-centered correctional residence. In: California. Corrections Board. *Corrections in the Community: Alternatives to Incarceration*. Sacramento: The Board, 1964. pp. 19-20.

Goter, Leroy P.; Hamm, Robert B.; and Osterberg, Mary N. *A Home Away from Home: Community Volunteers Empty the Jail*. Boulder, Colorado: Boulder County Juvenile Court, 1968. 46 pp.

Group Home Project: differential treatment-environments for delinquents. In: California, Youth Authority Department. *The Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*. Sacramento: The Department, 1969.

Gula, Martin. Group homes: new and differentiated tools in child welfare, delinquency and mental health. *Child Welfare*, 43(8):393-397, 1964.

Hardley, William F. Foster home project. In: American Correctional Association. *Proceedings, 1960*, pp. 347-353.

Herstein, Norman. What is a group home? *Child Welfare*, 43(8):403-414, 1964.

Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency. *Design for Change: A Program for Correctional Management*. Sacramento, California: The Institute, 1968. 581 pp.

Kellan, Gladys I. Court foster home program. *National Probation and Parole Association Journal*, January 1958.

McGrath, Rosemary. Residential group center for delinquent girls. *Welfare Reporter*, 14(July):66-73, 1963. (New Jersey Institutions and Agencies)

McNeil, Frances. A halfway-house program for delinquents. *Crime and Delinquency*, 13(4):538-544, 1967.

Minnesota. Corrections Department. Christiansen, Niels, Jr., and Nelson, William. A study of Minnesota Department of Corrections: juveniles in group homes. St. Paul, Minnesota: The Department, 1969. 32 pp.

National Study Service. *The Problem of Developing Adequate Foster Care for Wards of the California Youth Authority*. Report on a cooperative project undertaken jointly by the State Department of Social Welfare and the California Youth Authority. New York, 1964. 84 pp.

New York (State). Division for Youth. *Opportunity and Rehabilitation Centers*. Albany, New York: The Division, 1961.

Pearson, John W. A demonstration project: group homes for delinquents. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 21(1):28-37, 1968.

Pearson, John W., and Palmer, Theodore B. The use of group homes for delinquents in a differential treatment setting. (Group Home Project interim progress report). Sacramento, 1968. 29 pp.

Rabinow, Irving. Agency-operated group homes. *Child Welfare*, 43(8):415-422, 433, 1964.

Richmond, M. S. Correctional programming in the community. *Criminologica*, 6(1):2-9, 1968.

Saleebey, George. Youth correctional centers: a new dimension in rehabilitation. *Youth Authority Quarterly*, 22(1):26-30, 1969.

Southfields Residential Group Center. Wall, John M.; Elias, Albert; and Axelrod, Albert. *The Residential Group Center as a Treatment Method for Selected Youthful Offenders Age 16 and 17*. Anchorage, Kentucky, 1966. 47 pp.

Turner, Estelle J. A community group home for delinquent girls. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 21(3):14-22, 1968.

U.S. Bureau of Prisons. The residential center: corrections in the community. Washington, D.C.: The Bureau, 1969. 26 pp.

U.S. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development Office. Hargadine, John E. *The Attention Homes of Boulder, Colorado*. Washington, D.C.: The Office, 1968. 35 pp.

Washtenaw County (Michigan). Juvenile Court. *Foster Home Development Project*. Ann Arbor: The Court, 1964. 55 pp.

Winters, Carolyn, and Greer, Rae. A county looks to its girls. *California Youth Authority Quarterly*, 20(4):17-21, 1967.

Wisconsin. Public Welfare Department, Children and Youth Division. *Foster Family Care: A Program in Transition*. Madison: The Department, 1965. 46 pp.

Wolins, Martin, and Piliavin, Irving. *Institution or Foster Family: A Century of Debate*. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1964. 62 pp.

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1971 O-416-391

